arXiv:1703.03860v1 [quant-ph] 10 Mar 2017

Fault-tolerant conversion between adjacent Reed-Muller quantum codes based on gauge fixing

Dong-Xiao Quan[1,2],* Li-Li Zhu[1], Chang-xing Pei[1], and Barry C. Sanders[2,3,4,5]

1 State Key Laboratory of Integrated Services Networks,

Xidian University, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710071, P. R. China

2 Institute for Quantum Science and Technology,

University of Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4, Canada

3 Program in Quantum Information Science,

Canadian Institute for Advanced Research,

Toronto, Ontario M5G 1Z8, Canada

4 Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscale,

University of Science and Technology of China,

Hefei, Anhui 230026, P. R. China and

5 Shanghai Branch, CAS Center for Excellence and Synergetic

Innovation Center in Quantum Information and Quantum Physics,

University of Science and Technology of China, Shanghai 201315, P. R. China

(Dated: March 14, 2017)

Abstract

We design forward and backward fault-tolerant conversion circuits, which convert between the Steane code and the 15-qubit Reed-Muller quantum code so as to provide a universal transversal gate set. In our method, only 11 out of total 14 code stabilizers are measured, and we further enhance the circuit by simplifying some stabilizers; thus, we need only 64 CNOT gates for one round of forward-conversion stabilizer measurements and 60 CNOT gates for one round of backward-conversion stabilizer measurements. For conversion, we consider random single-qubit errors and their influence on syndromes of gauge operators, and we perform operations that yield quantum error correction and gauge fixing in a single step. We also generalize our method to conversion between any adjacent Reed-Muller quantum codes $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1, m)$ and $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}\,(1, m+1)$, for which we provide the necessary $3m+2$ stabilizers and the concomitant resources required.

Keywords: Quantum Error Correction, Reed-Muller Quantum Code, Code Conversion, Gauge Fixing

* dxquan@xidian.edu.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum information technology, with applications such as secure quantum communication or universal quantum computing, is extremely powerful but challenging due to the fragility of quantum information in the presence of noise, loss and decoherence. Fault-tolerant quantum error correction [1–3] ameliorates this problem of fragility by encoding plain-text quantum information into cipher text, processing this encoded information while also measuring error syndrome and correcting, and finally turning back to plain text. For fault-tolerant error correction, transversal gates are especially valuable as qubits in each code block act bitwise between corresponding qubits in each code block, thereby naturally preventing error propagation [4]. Unfortunately, no code can enable a universal set of transversal gates [4–6] so complicated strategies are employed to produce universal transversal gate sets. One strategy to circumvent the nonuniversal gate set problem is to employ magic-state distillation [7–12]. Although magic-state distillation has the advantage of a higher fault-tolerant threshold, the overhead in preparation and distillation is a major bottleneck for scalable quantum computing.

Alternative techniques can provide a universal transversal gate set. The Steane code [13] provides transversal Clifford gates but not the transversal $T := \mathrm{diag}(1, \exp\{\mathrm{i}\pi/4\})$ gate whereas the 15-qubit Reed-Muller quantum code (RMQC) [14] is transversal for controlled-NOT (CNOT), T and controlled-controlled-Z (CCZ) gates, but not for the Hadamard (H) gate. One way to produce a fault-tolerant universal gate set is to use the 15-qubit RMQC and, by the transversal operation and gauge fixing method, to realize the fault-tolerant H gates [15–17]. Another technique is code concatenation [18, 19], in which the qubits that make up the code are subsequently encoded into a second code so combining the 7-qubit Steane code and 15-qubit RMQC requires 105 qubits.

An alternative method is by code conversion [20–24], which converts between two codes to provide a universal transversal gate set. Direct conversion can be realized via Clifford operations, which is general for converting between different kinds of codes but requires 13 single-qubit and 74 two-qubit gates. Furthermore, this direct conversion requires error correction at every step to ensure fault tolerance [21]. Another direct conversion method is by gauge fixing as both codes correspond to the same subsystem code with different gauge qubits [20, 22], which is more efficient compared to the method of Clifford operations with

respect to the number of qubits and gates required.

Here we improve the fault-tolerant code-conversion method of Anderson, Duclos-Cianci and Poulin (ADP14) [20] by reducing the number of stabilizer measurements, which thus reduces the resource requirement. Furthermore we present explicit circuits for realizing our code conversion. Our method involves the "extended Reed-Muller quantum code"(ERMQC) and gauge fixing to design both forward and backward conversion circuits and error correction processes.

Our circuits and method have the following advantages. First we split some of the stabilizers into two gauge operators, which reduces the number of CNOT gates for the measurements of the syndromes. Second we consider random single-qubit errors and their influence on the syndromes of the gauge operators, using fixed syndromes to choose the operations so that we can do error correction and gauge fixing in one single step. Third we generalize the method to any adjacent RMQCs for which we need not measure all the stabilizers of the RMQC code. In contrast ADP14's approach discusses measuring all stabilizers and requiring $2^{m+1} - m - 2$ stabilizers. Our approach significantly reduces this stabilizer overhead.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In §II, we first give a brief review of the order-one RMQC and then give the stabilizer groups for the 7-qubit Steane code, the 15-qubit RMQC and ERMQC. In §III, we describe forward conversion from the 7-qubit Steane code to the 15-qubit RMQC in detail, and we deal with backward conversion in §IV. In §V, we explain how to convert between adjacent order-one RMQCs and the resources required. We conclude in §VI.

II. BASIC KNOWLEDGE

In this section, we give the basic concept of quantum error correction (QEC) and the stabilizer groups for the Steane code, the 15-qubit RMQC and ERMQC. From the relations for the stabilizer groups, we design the conversion scheme in following sections.

QEC [1–3] is an effective way to protect the information from the influence of noise. The quantum block notation $[[n, k, d]]$ refers to encoding k logical qubits into n physical qubits with code distance d so that $t < d/2$ random errors can be detected and corrected by syndrome measurements and error correction processes. The order-one RMQC [14] is written as $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1, m) = [[M - 1, 1, 3]]$, which encodes 1 logical qubit into $M - 1$ qubits with

distance 3 for $M := 2^m$. Adjacent codes are $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,m)$ and $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}\,(1,m+1)$. The Steane code is written as $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,3)$ and the 15-qubit RMQC is written as $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,4)$; in the framework of RMQC, they are adjacent RMQCs.

RMQCs are derived from the recursively defined classical order-one Reed-Muller code [25]. By deleting the first row and column of the generator matrix for the classical Reed-Muller code, we obtain $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,3)$'s generator matrix

$$\bar{G}(1,3) := \begin{bmatrix} \bar{G}(1,3)_1 \\ \bar{G}(1,3)_2 \\ \bar{G}(1,3)_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{1}$$

which can be used recursively to obtain the generator matrix for $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}\,(1,m+1)$ given by

$$\bar{G}\,(1,m+1) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{G}(1,m) & 0 & \bar{G}(1,m) \\ \bar{\mathbf{0}}_{M-1} & 1 & \bar{\mathbf{1}}_{M-1} \end{bmatrix},\ \bar{G}(1,m) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{G}(1,m)_1 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{G}(1,m)_m \end{bmatrix}, \tag{2}$$

where

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{b}}_M := b^{\otimes M},\ b \in \{0,1\}. \tag{3}$$

As all RMQCs are Calderbank-Shor-Steane codes [26, 27], we can subdivide their stabilizers into two parts corresponding to phase errors (X stabilizers) and flip errors (Z stabilizers). The X parts are obtained from the generator matrix of the code, and the Z parts are obtained from the generator matrix of the dual code, which is also the parity-check matrix of the code. As $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,3)$ is self dual [25], the stabilizers of the Steane code can be written as

$$\boldsymbol{S}(1,3) = \left\langle \bar{G}(1,3)^X, \bar{G}(1,3)^Z \right\rangle, \tag{4}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{G}(1,3)_1^{B\in\{X,Z\}} &= B_1B_3B_5B_7, \\ \bar{G}(1,3)_2^{B\in\{X,Z\}} &= B_2B_3B_6B_7, \\ \bar{G}(1,3)_3^{B\in\{X,Z\}} &= B_4B_5B_6B_7, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $G^{B\in\{X,Z\}}$ is a matrix obtained from G by substituting 1 by B and substituting 0 by I. As the Steane code is self dual, it is transversal for logical

$$\bar{H} := H^{\otimes n}, \tag{6}$$

where n is the number of qubits for the code [22, 28].

When $m \geq 3$, $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,m)$ is contained in its dual [25]. For the case $m = 4$, we define a matrix

$$\tilde{H}(1,4) := \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{H}(1,4)_1 \\ \tilde{H}(1,4)_2 \\ \tilde{H}(1,4)_3 \\ \tilde{H}(1,4)_4 \\ \tilde{H}(1,4)_5 \\ \tilde{H}(1,4)_6 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & \bar{G}_{1,3} & & & & & & & & \overline{\mathbf{0}}_8 & & \end{bmatrix}, \tag{7}$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}(1,4)_1^{B\in\{X,Z\}} =& B_1B_3B_9B_{11}, \\ \tilde{H}(1,4)_2^{B\in\{X,Z\}} =& B_2B_3B_{10}B_{11}, \\ \tilde{H}(1,4)_3^{B\in\{X,Z\}} =& B_3B_7B_{11}B_{15}, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

with $\tilde{H}$ and $\tilde{H}^{B\in\{X,Z\}}$ related in the same way as G and $G^{B\in\{X,Z\}}$ earlier.

Obviously

$$\tilde{H}(1,4)\bar{G}(1,4)^T = 0 \tag{9}$$

and the parity-check matrix for $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,4)$ is the vertical concatenation of the two matrices $\bar{G}(1,4)$ and $\tilde{H}(1,4)$. Thus, the stabilizers of the 15-qubit RMQC are

$$\boldsymbol{S}(1,4) = \left\langle \bar{G}(1,4)^X, \bar{G}(1,4)^Z, \tilde{H}(1,4)^Z \right\rangle \tag{10}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{G}(1,4)_1^{B\in\{X,Z\}} =& B_1B_3B_5B_7B_9B_{11}B_{13}B_{15}, \\ \bar{G}(1,4)_2^{B\in\{X,Z\}} =& B_2B_3B_6B_7B_{10}B_{11}B_{14}B_{15}, \\ \bar{G}(1,4)_3^{B\in\{X,Z\}} =& B_4B_5B_6B_7B_{12}B_{13}B_{14}B_{15}, \\ \bar{G}(1,4)_4^{B\in\{X,Z\}} =& B_8B_9B_{10}B_{11}B_{12}B_{13}B_{14}B_{15}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

As the syndromes of $\bar{G}(1,4)^Z$ can unambiguously discriminate all single-qubit X errors, the syndromes of $\tilde{H}(1,4)^Z$ are often omitted. The code is triply-even as its weight is 8 so it is transversal for logical $\overline{T} := T^{\otimes n}$ [22, 28].

From Eq. (2) we can see the 15-qubit RMQC comprises two blocks of Steane code for the first and last 7-qubit blocks plus another interconnecting qubit labeled 8. This interconnecting qubit entangles with the last 7-qubit block of Steane code. Thus, we can prepare an 8-qubit quantum state $|\phi\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}\,(|0\rangle\,|\bar{0}\rangle_3 + |1\rangle\,|\bar{1}\rangle_3)$ in the last 8 qubits [20], where $|\bar{b}\rangle_m\,,\ b \in \{0,1\}$, is the logical bit b encoded into the $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,m)$ code.

Together with the Steane code $|\psi\rangle = \alpha\,|\bar{0}\rangle_3 + \beta\,|\bar{1}\rangle_3$, we construct a 15-qubit ERMQC

$$|\phi\rangle_{3\backsim 4} = 1/\sqrt{2}\,(\alpha\,|\bar{0}\rangle_3 + \beta\,|\bar{1}\rangle_3)\,(|0\rangle\,|\bar{0}\rangle_3 + |1\rangle\,|\bar{1}\rangle_3)\,. \tag{12}$$

We refer to Eq. (12) as the no-error case for preparation of the 15-qubit ERMQC, and this ideal input preparation (12) is justified in the realistic case by introducing fault-tolerant preparation using gadgets [29]. The stabilizer group for this code can be expressed as

$$\boldsymbol{S}_{3\backsim 4} = \left\langle \left(\bar{G}(1,3)\otimes \bar{\mathbf{0}}_8\right)^X, \bar{G}(1,4)^X, \left(\bar{G}(1,3)\otimes \bar{\mathbf{0}}_8\right)^Z, \bar{G}(1,4)^Z \right\rangle. \tag{13}$$

It is also transversal for logical $\bar{H}$ as it is self dual. There is no information in the last 8 qubits so it has the same logical operations as the Steane code.

We define a subsystem code with the stabilizers of

$$\boldsymbol{S}^{\text{sub}}_{3\backsim 4} = \left\langle \bar{G}(1,4)^X, \left(\bar{G}(1,3)\otimes \bar{\mathbf{0}}_8\right)^Z, \bar{G}(1,4)^Z \right\rangle. \tag{14}$$

Pauli operators that commute with both the stabilizers and logical operators generate the gauge group [22] so the gauge group of this subsystem code is

$$\boldsymbol{G}^{\text{sub}}_{3\backsim 4} = \left\langle \bar{G}(1,4)^X, \left(\bar{G}(1,3)\otimes \bar{\mathbf{0}}_8\right)^X, \bar{G}(1,4)^Z, \tilde{H}(1,4)^Z \right\rangle. \tag{15}$$

Both the 15-qubit RMQC and the ERMQC belong to this subsystem code with different gauge operators so they can convert to each other by gauge fixing.

III. CONVERT FROM THE STEANE CODE TO THE 15-QUBIT RMQC

In this section we deal with forward conversion, which converts from the Steane code to the 15-qubit RMQC. From Eqs. (10) and (13), we see that the ERMQC satisfies all the other stabilizers of the 15-qubit RMQC except for $\tilde{H}(1,4)^Z_i, i = 1,2,3$. Our procedure entails measuring the stabilizers of $\tilde{H}(1,4)^Z_i$, $i = 1,2,3$, given in Eq. (8). The i^{th} Z syndrome is

$$S_i = \mathbb{M}\left(\tilde{H}(1,4)^Z_i\right) \in \{0,1\}, \quad i = 1,2,3, \tag{16}$$

TABLE I. Relation between stabilizer measurement results and corresponding operations for forward conversion in the no-error case (12) with $S_i = \mathbb{M}\left(\tilde{H}(1,4)_i^Z\right)$.

S_1	S_2	S_3	operation	S_1	S_2	S_3	operation
0	0	0	I	1	0	0	$X_{10}X_{11}X_{14}X_{15}$
0	0	1	$X_{12}X_{13}X_{14}X_{15}$	1	0	1	$X_{10}X_{11}X_{12}X_{13}$
0	1	0	$X_9X_{11}X_{13}X_{15}$	1	1	0	$X_9X_{10}X_{13}X_{14}$
0	1	1	$X_9X_{11}X_{12}X_{14}$	1	1	1	$X_9X_{10}X_{12}X_{15}$

for $\mathbb{M}(\tilde{H})$ denoting the syndrome measurement result of stabilizer $\tilde{H}$. Operations are then performed on the collapsed state according to syndromes as shown in Table I in order to get the 15-qubit RMQC.

The operations in Table I are chosen as follows. For example, if we obtain $S_1 = S_2 = 0$ and $S_3 = 1$, then we need to use X-type operations, which commute with all Z-type stabilizers except $\tilde{H}(1,4)_3^Z$ so we can choose $X_{12}X_{13}X_{14}X_{15}$ as the operations. If we obtain $S_1 = S_2 = 1$ and $S_3 = 0$, then we can choose the operations as $X_9X_{10}X_{13}X_{14}$, which anti-commute with $\tilde{H}(1,4)_1^Z$ and $\tilde{H}(1,4)_2^Z$ but commute with all the others.

We can divide our analysis into two cases: the no-error case, which assumes ideal state preparation (12), and the case of a single–qubit error occurring before the code conversion. In the case of a single-qubit error, this error can influence the syndromes of Table I and accordingly result in wrong operations so we need to distinguish single-qubit errors and fix the syndromes before the corrections in Table I. The syndromes of $S(1,4)$ are

$$S(1,4)_i^{B\in\{X,Z\}} = \mathbb{M}\left(\bar{G}(1,4)_i^{B\in\{X,Z\}}\right), \quad i = 1,2,3,4, \tag{17}$$

and the single-qubit errors are shown in Table II.

By the X-type syndromes of Table II, we can identify the single-qubit Z error represented as Z_i. The error Z_i has no influence on the syndromes of Table I so we need only add the Z_i operation in the correction process. Similarly, by the Z-type syndromes of Table II, we can identify the single-qubit X error written as X_j. However, this X error could also result in wrong syndromes of Table I so we need to consider the influence of this error when choosing the operations.

Let us consider the point in Fig. 1 subsequent to the S_3 measurement at which point we

TABLE II. Relation between stabilizer measurement results and single-qubit errors. The syndromes indicate the bit error when $B = Z$, and indicate the phase error when $B = X$.

$S(1,4)_1^B$	$S(1,4)_2^B$	$S(1,4)_3^B$	$S(1,4)_4^B$	error	$S(1,4)_1^B$	$S(1,4)_2^B$	$S(1,4)_3^B$	$S(1,4)_4^B$	error
0	0	0	0	NO	0	0	0	1	8
0	0	1	0	4	0	0	1	1	12
0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	10
0	1	1	0	6	0	1	1	1	14
1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	9
1	0	1	0	5	1	0	1	1	13
1	1	0	0	3	1	1	0	1	11
1	1	1	0	7	1	1	1	1	15

have measured all three syndromes S_1, S_2 and S_3. Then we can simplify the measurement according to

$$\begin{aligned} S\left(1,4\right)_1^Z =& \mathbb{M}\left(\bar{G}(1,4)_1^Z\right) \\ =& \mathbb{M}\left(Z_1Z_3Z_5Z_7Z_9Z_{11}Z_{13}Z_{15}\right) \\ =& \mathbb{M}\left(Z_3Z_7Z_{11}Z_{15}Z_1Z_5Z_9Z_{13}\right) \\ =& \underbrace{\mathbb{M}\left(Z_3Z_7Z_{11}Z_{15}\right)}_{S_3} \oplus \underbrace{\mathbb{M}\left(Z_1Z_5Z_9Z_{13}\right)}_{S_4} \\ =& S_3 \oplus S_4, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where we have used commutativity of Z operators in the second step and, for the third step, we have used the syndrome definition (16) and the expression for $\tilde{H}(1,4)_i^Z$ given in Eq. (8). Generalizing Eq. (18), we obtain the simplifying assignments

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{M}\left(\bar{G}(1,4)_1^Z\right) \rightarrow& S_4 = \mathbb{M}\left(Z_1Z_5Z_9Z_{13}\right), \\ \mathbb{M}\left(\bar{G}(1,4)_2^Z\right) \rightarrow& S_5 = \mathbb{M}\left(Z_2Z_6Z_{10}Z_{14}\right), \\ \mathbb{M}\left(\bar{G}(1,4)_3^Z\right) \rightarrow& S_6 = \mathbb{M}\left(Z_4Z_5Z_{12}Z_{13}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Unfortunately

$$S_7 = \mathbb{M}\left(Z_8Z_9Z_{10}Z_{11}Z_{12}Z_{13}Z_{14}Z_{15}\right) \tag{20}$$

cannot be simplified in this way.

The total set of Z-type syndromes is $\{S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_7\}$. Using the technique shown in Eq. (18), we obtain two additional relations

$$S(1,4)_2^Z = S_3 \oplus S_5,\ S(1,4)_3^Z = S_3 \oplus S_5 \oplus S_2 \oplus S_6 \tag{21}$$

plus

$$S(1,4)_4^Z = S_7 \tag{22}$$

and Table II to deduce the single-qubit X error X_j. Then we modify the first three syndromes $S_{1,2,3}$ using the relation

$$Z_j \in S_n \implies S_n = S_n \oplus 1 (n = 1, 2, 3). \tag{23}$$

Now we use the modified $S_{1,2,3}$ and Table I to deduce the operations written as $X_{\rm sub}$. Thus, the total operations we need to perform for the correction process are $X_{\rm sub} X_j Z_i$; by these operations we obtain the 15-qubit RMQC.

The forward conversion circuit is shown in Fig. 1, where we need 4 H gates and 12 CNOT gates for preparation and 11 ancillary qubits plus 64 CNOT gates for one round of syndrome measurement. The syndrome measurement shown in Fig. 1 is not fault-tolerant as the single error may spread into multiple errors. In order to ensure fault-tolerant measurement, we use the Shor state [30], or use encoded Bell pairs [31] or use encoded blocks [32, 33] to perform syndrome measurement, repeat the syndrome measurement three times and then make a majority vote to ensure fault-tolerant measurement.

Recall that we separately consider the no-error case (12) and the case of a single-qubit error. Even in the no-error case, subsequent to the S_1, S_2 and S_3 syndrome measurements, the ERMC collapses to the 15-qubit RMQC with probability 1/8. Thus, we need to apply the fixing operation shown in Table I with probability 7/8. This fixing operation is shown as the correct box in Fig. 1. After this correction we need another round of syndrome measurements; this round needs 8 ancillary qubits to measure the stabilizers of $\bar{G}(1,4)^X$ and $\bar{G}(1,4)^Z$ in order to judge whether an error happened during the correction process. If an error happened in the correction phase, then we need to repeat the correction and syndrome measurement one more time. As we assume the error probability is sufficiently small that we can ignore more than one error occurring during the entire process, we are sure that all eight syndromes are zero in this final step, which we verify by this final syndrome measurement.



FIG. 1. Conversion circuit from Steane code to 15-qubit RMQC. Quantum information is first encoded into the Steane code $|\psi\rangle = \alpha\,|\bar{0}\rangle_3 + \beta\,|\bar{1}\rangle_3$ in qubits 1–7. At the same time qubits 8–15 are prepared in the state $|\phi\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}\,(|0\rangle\,|\bar{0}\rangle_3 + |1\rangle\,|\bar{1}\rangle_3)$. The ancillary qubits 1–11 are used to measure the syndromes $S_1 = \mathbb{M}(Z_1Z_3Z_9Z_{11})$, $S_2 = \mathbb{M}(Z_2Z_3Z_{10}Z_{11})$, $S_3 = \mathbb{M}(Z_3Z_7Z_{11}Z_{15})$, $S_4 = \mathbb{M}(Z_1Z_5Z_9Z_{13})$, $S_5 = \mathbb{M}(Z_2Z_6Z_{10}Z_{14})$, $S_6 = \mathbb{M}(Z_4Z_5Z_{12}Z_{13})$, $S_7 = \mathbb{M}(Z_8Z_9Z_{10}Z_{11}Z_{12}Z_{13}Z_{14}Z_{15})$, $S_8 = \mathbb{M}(X_1X_3X_5X_7X_9X_{11}X_{13}X_{15})$, $S_9 = \mathbb{M}(X_2X_3X_6X_7X_{10}X_{11}X_{14}X_{15})$, $S_{10} = \mathbb{M}(X_4X_5X_6X_7X_{12}X_{13}X_{14}X_{15})$, $S_{11} = \mathbb{M}(X_8X_9X_{10}X_{11}X_{12}X_{13}X_{14}X_{15})$.

IV. CONVERSION FROM THE 15-QUBIT RMQC TO THE STEANE CODE

In this section we deal with the backward conversion, which first converts from the 15-qubit RMQC to the ERMQC then drops the last 8 qubits to get the Steane code.

As in §III, we first deal with the ideal case of no error in the 15-qubit RMQC. From Eqs. (10) and (13), we see that the 15-qubit RMQC satisfies all the other stabilizers of the ERMQC except for $\bar{G}(1,3)_i^X$, $i = 1,2,3$. Thus, we measure these three stabilizers $\bar{G}(1,3)_i^X$, $i = 1,2,3$, given in Eq. (5), and write the i^{th} X syndrome as

$$S_i' = \mathbb{M}\left(\bar{G}(1,3)_i^X\right) \in \{0,1\}, \quad i = 1,2,3. \tag{24}$$

TABLE III. Relation between stabilizer measurement results and corresponding operations for backward conversion in the no-error case.

S_1'	S_2'	S_3'	operation	S_1'	S_2'	S_3'	operation
0	0	0	I	1	0	0	$Z_2Z_3Z_{10}Z_{11}$
0	0	1	$Z_3Z_7Z_{11}Z_{15}$	1	0	1	$Z_2Z_7Z_{10}Z_{15}$
0	1	0	$Z_1Z_3Z_9Z_{11}$	1	1	0	$Z_1Z_2Z_9Z_{10}$
0	1	1	$Z_1Z_7Z_9Z_{15}$	1	1	1	$Z_1Z_2Z_3Z_7Z_9Z_{10}Z_{11}Z_{15}$

Following the syndrome measurements, we perform the fixing operations on the collapsed state according to Table III. In Table III the operations are chosen similar as before in §III. For example, if we obtain $S_1' = S_2' = 0$ and $S_3' = 1$, then we can choose $Z_3Z_7Z_{11}Z_{15}$ as the fixing operations, which anti-commute with $\bar{G}(1,3)_3^X$ but commute with all the other stabilizers of $\boldsymbol{S}_{3\backsim 4}$.

We now consider random single-qubit errors and their influence on the syndromes of Table III using an approach similar to that used in §III. First we measure the Z-type syndromes of Table II to deduce the single-qubit X error on qubit i, written as X_i. This single-qubit error has no influence on the syndromes of Table III so we need only add the X_i operation in the correction process. For the X-type syndromes, as we already have the syndromes S_1', S_2' and S_3', similar as in §III, by generalizing Eq. (18), we obtain the simplifying assignments

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{M}\left(\bar{G}(1,4)_1^X\right) &\rightarrow S_4' = \mathbb{M}\left(X_9X_{11}X_{13}X_{15}\right), \\
\mathbb{M}\left(\bar{G}(1,4)_2^X\right) &\rightarrow S_5' = \mathbb{M}\left(X_{10}X_{11}X_{14}X_{15}\right), \\
\mathbb{M}\left(\bar{G}(1,4)_3^X\right) &\rightarrow S_6' = \mathbb{M}\left(X_{12}X_{13}X_{14}X_{15}\right), \\
\mathbb{M}\left(\bar{G}(1,4)_4^X\right) &\rightarrow S_7' = \mathbb{M}\left(X_8X_9X_{10}X_{11}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

The relations between these X-type syndromes and $S(1,4)_{1,2,3,4}^X$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
S(1,4)_1^X &= S_1' \oplus S_4', \quad S(1,4)_2^X = S_2' \oplus S_5', \\
S(1,4)_3^X &= S_3' \oplus S_6', \quad S(1,4)_4^X = S_6' \oplus S_7'.
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

We use the syndrome set $\{S_1', S_2', \ldots, S_7'\}$ and the relations in Eq. (26) as well as Table II to deduce the single-qubit Z error denoted Z_j. Following we modify the first three syndromes

according to

$$X_j \in S'_n \implies S'_n = S'_n \oplus 1 (n = 1, 2, 3). \tag{27}$$

Now we use the fixed syndromes $S'_{1,2,3}$ and Table III to get the operations written as $Z_{\rm sub}$, the total operations we need perform in the correction process will be $Z_{\rm sub} Z_j X_i$, by these operations we get the 15-qubit ERMQC. Then we can discard the last 8 qubits to get the Steane code.

The backward conversion circuit is shown in Fig. 2, which shows that we need 11 ancillary qubits and 60 CNOT gates for one round of syndrome measurements. To guaranty fault tolerance, the method used in §III to make fault-tolerant measurements should also be applied here. The probability of obtaining the correct Steane code without applying the fixing operation is also 1/8 for the no-error case as is the case for forward conversion. Thus, with probability 1/8, the procedure terminates here with no error. Otherwise, in order to obtain the correct Steane code without error, then, after the correction process, we undertake another round of syndrome measurements; this additional round needs 6 ancillary qubits to measure the stabilizers of $\bar{G}(1,3)^X$ and $\bar{G}(1,3)^Z$ to determine whether an error happened during the correction process. If an error is detected, we repeat the correction and syndrome measurement one more time. Then, because we allow only one error, the procedure is complete.

V. CONVERT BETWEEN ADJACENT RMQCS

As the recursive relation (2) exists for all adjacent RMQCs, denoted $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,m)$ and $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}\,(1,m+1)$, our method is suitable for all conversions between these adjacent codes. Now we explain how to convert between adjacent RMQCs and the resources needed.

Beginning with the case $m = 3$ and Eq. (2), we obtain the generator matrix $\bar{G}(1,m)$ and $\bar{G}\,(1,m+1)$ for $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,m)$ and $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}\,(1,m+1)$. Accordingly we can define a matrix

$$\tilde{H}\,(1,m+1) := \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{H}\,(1,m+1)_1 \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{H}\,(1,m+1)_m \\ \bar{G}(1,m) \quad \bar{\mathbf{0}}_{2^m} \\ \tilde{H}(1,m) \quad \bar{\mathbf{0}}_{2^m} \\ \bar{\mathbf{0}}_{2^m} \quad \tilde{H}(1,m) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{28}$$



FIG. 2. Conversion circuit from 15-qubit RMQC to Steane code. The ancillary qubits 1–11 are used to measure the syndromes $S'_1 = \mathbb{M}(X_1X_3X_5X_7)$, $S'_2 = \mathbb{M}(X_2X_3X_6X_7)$, $S'_3 = \mathbb{M}(X_4X_5X_6X_7)$, $S'_4 = \mathbb{M}(X_9X_{11}X_{13}X_{15})$, $S'_5 = \mathbb{M}(X_{10}X_{11}X_{14}X_{15})$, $S'_6 = \mathbb{M}(X_{12}X_{13}X_{14}X_{15})$, $S'_7 = \mathbb{M}(X_8X_9X_{10}X_{11})$, $S'_8 = \mathbb{M}(Z_1Z_3Z_5Z_7Z_9Z_{11}Z_{13}Z_{15})$, $S'_9 = \mathbb{M}(Z_2Z_3Z_6Z_7Z_{10}Z_{11}Z_{14}Z_{15})$, $S'_{10} = \mathbb{M}(Z_4Z_5Z_6Z_7Z_{12}Z_{13}Z_{14}Z_{15})$, $S'_{11} = \mathbb{M}(Z_8Z_9Z_{10}Z_{11}Z_{12}Z_{13}Z_{14}Z_{15})$. At the end of the circuit we get the 15-qubit ERMQC, and then, by deleting the last 8 qubits, we obtain Steane code.

from $m = 4$ where

$$\tilde{H}(1, m+1)_1 = \mathbf{1}(1, 3), \tilde{H}(1, m+1)_2 = \mathbf{1}(2, 3) \tag{29}$$

and

$$\tilde{H}(1, m+1)_n = \mathbf{1}\left(3, 3 + 2^{n-1}\right), \ 3 \leq n \leq m, \tag{30}$$

and $\mathbf{1}(x, y)$ means a vector is 1 at the positions of $x, y, x + 2^m, y + 2^m$, and 0 for the other elements. We can verify

$$\tilde{H}(1, m+1)\bar{G}(1, m+1)^T = 0 \tag{31}$$

and the parity-check matrix for $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1, m+1)$, namely, $\bar{H}(1, m+1)$, is the vertical concatenation of $\bar{G}(1, m+1)$ and $\tilde{H}(1, m+1)$. Thus, the stabilizer group for $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1, m+1)$ can be written as

$$\boldsymbol{S}(1, m+1) = \left\langle \bar{G}(1, m+1)^X, \bar{G}(1, m+1)^Z, \tilde{H}(1, m+1)^Z \right\rangle. \tag{32}$$

The ERMQC for the conversion from m to $m+1$ can be written as

$$|\phi\rangle_{m\backsim m+1} = 1/\sqrt{2}\,(\alpha\,|\bar{0}\rangle_m + \beta\,|\bar{1}\rangle_m)\,(|0\rangle\,|\bar{0}\rangle_m + |1\rangle\,|\bar{1}\rangle_m)\,. \tag{33}$$

The stabilizer group for this code can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{S}_{m\backsim m+1} = \Big\langle\, &\left(\bar{G}(1,m)\otimes\bar{\mathbf{0}}_{2^m}\right)^X, \bar{G}\,(1,m+1)^X, \left(\bar{G}(1,m)\otimes\bar{\mathbf{0}}_{2^m}\right)^Z, \\ &\bar{G}\,(1,m+1)^Z, \left(\tilde{H}(1,m)\otimes\bar{\mathbf{0}}_{2^m}\right)^Z, \left(\bar{\mathbf{0}}_{2^m}\otimes\tilde{H}(1,m)\right)^Z \Big\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Both the RMQC and ERMQC correspond to a subsystem code with stabilizer group of

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{S}^{\rm sub}_{m\backsim m+1} = \Big\langle &\bar{G}\,(1,m+1)^X, \bar{G}\,(1,m+1)^Z, \left(\bar{G}(1,m)\otimes\bar{\mathbf{0}}_{2^m}\right)^Z, \\ &\left(\tilde{H}(1,m)\otimes\bar{\mathbf{0}}_{2^m}\right)^Z, \left(\bar{\mathbf{0}}_{2^m}\otimes\tilde{H}(1,m)\right)^Z \Big\rangle\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

with different gauge operators so they can convert to each other by gauge fixing.

For forward conversion, which converts from $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,m)$ to $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}\,(1,m+1)$, we compare Eq. (34) with Eq. (32) to discover that the first m stabilizers of $\tilde{H}\,(1,m+1)^Z$ may not be satisfied. Thus, in order to convert forward, we need only measure these m stabilizers and choose the corresponding operations to correct the collapsed state to $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}\,(1,m+1)$. These X-type operations can be chosen similar as in §III, which commute with all the other stabilizers except for the stabilizers which were measured to be 1.

For backward conversion, which converts from $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}\,(1,m+1)$ to $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,m)$, we discover that the stabilizers $\left(\bar{G}(1,m)\otimes\bar{\mathbf{0}}_{2^m}\right)^X$ of ERMQC may not be satisfied by comparing Eq. (32) with Eq. (34). Thus, we need m ancillary qubits to measure these stabilizers and do corresponding operations to get the ERMQC. Finally we drop the last 2^m qubits to obtain $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,m)$.

In order to convert fault tolerantly, for both directions of conversion, we need also measure the stabilizers of $\bar{G}\,(1,m+1)^X$ and $\bar{G}\,(1,m+1)^Z$ to distinguish the single-qubit error, and fix the first m syndromes using the relations in Eqs. (23) and (27) with $n = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ respectively. Then, by using the fixed syndromes, we choose the correct fixing operations and perform error correction and fixing operations in one single step. Thus, for both forward and backward conversions, we need $3m+2$ ancillary qubits in total, whereas, in Ref. [20], they measure all the stabilizers and refer to $2^{m+1}-m-2$ syndromes to do error correction. For the case $m = 3$, the number of useful syndromes is the same, but for larger m, our method reduces the number exponentially with m.

For forward conversion we need $(2m+2)\times 2^m + 4m$ CNOT gates, and for backward conversion we need $(2m+2)\times 2^m + m\times 2^{m-1}$ CNOT gates for one round of syndrome measurement. Using the simplified method shown in Eq. (18), CNOT gates can be further reduced. Forward conversion will need $(2m+2)\times 2^m$ CNOT gates, the same number of gates as to measure the syndromes of $\bar{G}\left(1,m+1\right)^X$ and $\bar{G}\left(1,m+1\right)^Z$; the number of CNOT gates for backward conversion is reduced to $(m+1)\times 2^m + (2m+1)\times 2^{m-1}$, even 2^{m-1} gates smaller than that to measure $\bar{G}\left(1,m+1\right)^X$ and $\bar{G}\left(1,m+1\right)^Z$. For the case $m=3$, the ancillary qubits will be 11 and the CNOT gates will be 64 and 60 respectively for one round of syndrome measurement for forward and backward conversion, the same as shown in Figs. 1 and 2.

We simulate both directions of conversion using MATLAB® for the case of $m=3$ and $m=4$, where we introduce random single-qubit errors. The X-type stabilizer measurement is realized by first making a transversal $\bar{H}$, defined in Eq. (6), to the code, which converts an X measurement to a Z measurement and vice versa. Thus, we can measure the corresponding Z-type stabilizer in the dual code. Then we use the transversal $\bar{H}$ to convert back to the original code space. The result shows that our method can detect the error correctly and can fulfill the conversion successfully based on the fixed syndromes.

VI. CONCLUSION

We designed a concrete fault-tolerant method to convert between adjacent RMQCs based on gauge fixing. We use the special case of converting from the Steane code to the 15-qubit RMQC as an example to explain our method in detail. Our method considers random single-qubit errors and their influence on the syndromes that we use to complete the conversion. Also we use the relation between gauge operators and stabilizers to simplify the syndrome-measurement circuit and thereby reduce the required number of CNOT gates.

We extend this special case to the general case of adjacent RMQCs. In particular we provide all stabilizers needed to be measured for conversion, and we discuss all requisite ancillary qubits and CNOT gates. Conversion between $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,3)$ and $\overline{\mathsf{RM}}(1,4)$ enables a universal transversal set of gates. Furthermore we can also convert between any adjacent order-one RMQCs so to non-adjacent RMQCs conversion, which enables all gates of the type $\sqrt[2^{m-4}]{T}$ to be transversal for $m\geq 4$ [4].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

DXQ, LLZ and CXP acknowledge the support from National Natural Science Foundation of China No. 61372076 and No. 61301171, the 111 Project (No. B08038), the China Scholarship Council (No. 201506965068); BCS appreciates financial support from the Institute for Quantum Information and Matter, an NSF Physics Frontiers Center (NSF Grant PHY-1125565) with support of the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation (GBMF-2644), and financial support NSERC, AITF, China's 1000 Talent Plan and National Natural Science Foundation of China No. 11675164.

[1] P. W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **52**, R2493 (1995).

[2] D. Gottesman, *Stabilizer Codes and Quantum Error Correction*, Ph.D. thesis, Caltech, Pasadena (1997).

[3] P. W. Shor, in *Proc. 37th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, FOCS '96 (IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, 1996) pp. 56–65.

[4] B. Zeng, A. Cross, and I. L. Chuang, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **57**, 6272 (2011).

[5] B. Eastin and E. Knill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 110502 (2009).

[6] X. Chen, H. Chung, A. W. Cross, B. Zeng, and I. L. Chuang, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 012353 (2008).

[7] S. Bravyi and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 022316 (2005).

[8] B. W. Reichardt, Quantum Inf. Process. **4**, 251 (2005).

[9] A. M. Meier, B. Eastin, and E. Knill, Quantum Inf. Comput. **13**, 195 (2013).

[10] S. Bravyi and J. Haah, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 052329 (2012).

[11] C. Jones, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 042305 (2013).

[12] A. G. Fowler, S. J. Devitt, and C. Jones, Sci. Rep. **3**, 1939 (2013).

[13] A. M. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 793 (1996).

[14] A. Steane, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **45**, 1701 (1999).

[15] A. Paetznick and B. W. Reichardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 090505 (2013).

[16] H. Bombin, New J. Phys. **17**, 083002 (2015).

[17] A. Kubica and M. E. Beverland, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 032330 (2015).

[18] T. Jochym-O'Connor and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 010505 (2014).

[19] T. Jochym-O'Connor and S. D. Bartlett, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 022323 (2016).

[20] J. T. Anderson, G. Duclos-Cianci, and D. Poulin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 080501 (2014).

[21] Y. Hwang, B.-S. Choi, Y.-C. Ko, and J. Heo, arXiv: 1511.02596 (2015).

[22] S. Bravyi and A. Cross, arXiv: 1509.03239 (2015).

[23] C. D. Hill, A. G. Fowler, D. S. Wang, and L. C. L. Hollenberg, Quantum Inf. Comput. **13**, 439 (2013).

[24] B.-S. Choi, Quantum Inf. Process. **14**, 2775 (2015).

[25] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes*, North-Holland Mathematical Library, Vol. 16 (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977).

[26] A. Steane, Proc. R. Soc. A **452**, 2551 (1996).

[27] A. R. Calderbank and P. W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1098 (1996).

[28] K. Betsumiya and A. Munemasa, J. London Math. Soc. **86**, 1 (2012).

[29] P. Aliferis, D. Gottesman, and J. Preskill, Quantum Inf. Comput. **6**, 97 (2006).

[30] Y. S. Weinstein, Quantum Inf. Process. **14**, 1841 (2015).

[31] E. Knill, Nature **434**, 39 (2005).

[32] A. M. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2252 (1997).

[33] Y. S. Weinstein, Quantum Inf. Process. **15**, 1263 (2016).